

## Remarks

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the objections and/or rejections and reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15-20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Rao (U.S. 2005/0182697). Claims 2-4, 7-9, 12-14, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rao in view of Mittal (U.S. 2005/0022182).

These rejections are defective because, *inter alia*, the references of Rao and Mittal, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claims as required by 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 103(a).

Claim 1 sets forth:

“A computer-implemented method, comprising:  
    sending an Open Mobile Alliance (OMA) device  
management (DM) alert from a client device to an OMA DM server  
to initiate a management action on the OMA DM server; and  
    sending a reply from the OMA DM server to the client device  
in response to the OMA DM alert.”

Rao does not disclose, *inter alia*, “sending an Open Mobile Alliance (OMA) device management (DM) alert **from a client device to an OMA DM server to initiate a management action on the OMA DM server.**”

In the above-referenced Office Action, the Examiner alleges that this feature is disclosed in paragraphs [0017], [0020], [0022], and [0024] of Rao. This is incorrect.

Paragraph [0017] (lines 1-7) discloses that a DM server 109 and a device 107 can communicate back and forth. However, this section of Rao is completely silent with regard to the sending of an OMA DM alert **from a client device to an OMA DM server to initiate a management action on the OMA DM server**, as claimed.

Paragraph [0020] of Rao discloses that events received by the DM server 109, for example, client generated events, alerts, etc., can be associated with an appropriate billing code by the DM server 109. Again, this section of Rao is completely silent with regard to the **sending of an OMA DM alert from a client device to an OMA DM server to initiate a management action on the OMA DM server**. Although Rao mentions client generated events, alerts, etc., Rao does not provide any disclosure specifying that such client generated events, alerts, etc., comprise **an OMA DM alert** sent from a client device to an OMA DM server **to initiate a management action on the OMA DM server**, as claimed.

Paragraph [0022] of Rao discusses the association by the DM network 100 of billing codes with activities (e.g., transfer of data, upload or download of content, device management activities, etc.). However, this section does not provide any disclosure related to the **sending of an OMA DM alert from a client device to an**

**OMA DM server to initiate a management action on the OMA DM server, as claimed.**

Paragraph [0024] of Rao discusses the receipt of device notifications by the DM server 109. Again, this section does not provide any disclosure related to the **sending of an OMA DM alert from a client device to an OMA DM server to initiate a management action on the OMA DM server, as claimed.**

Mittal fails to remedy the glaring deficiencies of Rao.

Accordingly, since Rao and Mittal, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 1 as required by 35 U.S.C. 102(e), Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable. Applicant further submits that independent claims 6, 11, and 16 and their corresponding dependent claims are allowable for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1-24 are allowable.

Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. These features have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ John A. Merecki /

Dated: January 8, 2007

John A. Merecki  
Reg. No. 35,812

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, NY 12207  
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone  
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile